

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action in which Claims 1-18 were rejected. Claims 1-18, as amended, are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary.

On June 28, 2005, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Grant and Applicant's attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 was discussed. Although no agreement was reached, Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Grant for the opportunity to discuss the rejections.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph.

Section 1 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In response, each of independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 is amended to further clarify that the recited "back of second sheet to front of first sheet" may also be known as a --(face up)-- output accumulation sequence. Since one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the first sheet in an output accumulation sequence is the first sheet being discharged while the second sheet in an output accumulation sequence would be the second sheet being discharged, a "back of second sheet to front of first sheet" clearly refers what may alternatively be known as a face up discharge order. Thus, no new matter is believed to have been added. Claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Based Upon Tsuchitoi.

Section 2 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuchitoi, U.S. Patent No. 5,872,900. Claims 1-18, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Tsuchitoi.

A. Claims 1, 7 and 13.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 recite a method, a system and a program storage device for sequencing sheets of a print job having multiple sheets. Each of Claims 1, 7 and 13, as amended, specifically recites discovering an output accumulation sequence of a selected one of a plurality of potential destinations of the print job. Each of Claims 1, 3 and 17 further recites that in response to discovering that the selected one of the plurality of potential destinations has a back of second sheet to front of first sheet (face up) output accumulation sequence, the sheets of the print job are sequenced in reverse order.

Tsuchitoi fails to disclose a method (Claim 1), a system (Claim 7) or a program storage device (Claim 13) in which a print job has a plurality of potential destinations and in which the particular output accumulation sequence of a selected one of the destinations for the print job is discovered to determine whether sheets of a print job should be sequenced in reverse order. The method, system and program recited in Claims 1, 7 and 13 enable multiple potential destinations to be provided to a print job while reducing the likelihood that the print job will be sequenced out of order.

Tsuchitoi fails to disclose a method, a system or a program in which a print job is provided with multiple potential destinations, in which one of the destinations is selected and in which the particular output accumulation sequence of the selected destination is discovered so as to appropriately sequence the sheets of the print job in reverse order if the selected destination is discovered to have a face up output accumulation sequence. In rejecting Claims 1, 7 and 13, the Office Action refers to column 8, lines 63-67 of Tsuchitoi. However, the cited portion of Tsuchitoi merely states that “the page numbers of print data to be transmitted to the printer 100 are arranged in a descending order or an ascending order.” Nowhere does Tsuchitoi disclose that a print job may be selectively sent to one of multiple potential destinations. Nowhere does Tsuchitoi disclose or suggest that one of the potential destinations is selectively chosen for the print job. Nowhere does Tsuchitoi disclose or suggest that the particular output accumulation sequence of the selected or

chosen destination is discovered. Nowhere does Tsuchitoi disclose or suggest that the sheets of the print job are sequenced in reverse order in response to discovering that a selected or chosen destination has a face up output accumulation sequence.

In contrast, Tsuchitoi merely appears to disclose that the print job or print data sent to a single destination (printer 100) is arranged in either a descending order or an ascending order. Rather than discovering an output accumulation sequence of a chosen destination and automatically reversing the sequence of sheet of a print job in response to the output accumulation sequence being a face up sequence as recited in Claims 1, 7 and 13, Tsuchitoi merely appears to disclose, at most, providing a user with an option to print the pages of a print job in a descending order or an ascending order. As noted in the background of the present application, "one problem with this solution is that the user may forget to select the option to print the pages in reverse order. A second problem with this solution is that a user may not know what the output accumulation sequence is for the intended destination." (see p. 1 of the present application). In contrast to the method, system and program of claims 1, 7 and 13, Tsuchitoi fails to address or solve these problems. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3 and 17, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Tsuchitoi. Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 depend from Claims 1, 3 and 17 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claims 2, 8 and 14.

Claims 2, 8 and 14 depend from Claims 1, 7 and 13 and further recite that discovering the output accumulation sequence includes ascertaining the selected one of the plurality of potential destinations of the print job.

Tsuchitoi fails to disclose a method, system or program in which the selected one of the plurality of potential destinations of a print job is ascertained. In contrast, Tsuchitoi merely discloses a single destination, printer 100. Therefore, Tsuchitoi cannot ascertain one of a plurality of potential destinations for a print job. Claims 2, 8 and 14, as amended, overcome the rejection based upon Tsuchitoi for this additional reason.

C. Claims 3, 9 and 15.

Claims 3, 9 and 15 recite searching an index for a record of the selected one of the plurality of potential destinations of a print job and discovering the output accumulation sequence from the record.

Tsuchitoi fails to disclose a plurality of potential destinations for a print job. In contrast, Tsuchitoi merely discloses a single destination, printer 100. Moreover, Tsuchitoi fails to disclose an index which includes records of output accumulation sequences for the potential destinations, wherein the index may be searched for a record of the output accumulation sequence for the particular selected destination. With respect to Claims 3 and 15, the Office Action asserts that Tsuchitoi teaches searching an index (via controller 151) for a record of the destination 100. However, nowhere does Tsuchitoi teach any index that includes records of different output accumulation sequences for different potential destinations of a print job. Thus, Claims 3, 9 and 15 overcome the rejection based upon Tsuchitoi for this additional reason.

IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-18 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated,

otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 3, 2005 By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276